



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/867,642	05/30/2001	Ilia Zverev	IFT774US	8001
24131	7590	12/11/2006	EXAMINER	
LERNER GREENBERG STEMER LLP			JONES, HUGH M	
P O BOX 2480			ART UNIT	
HOLLYWOOD, FL 33022-2480			PAPER NUMBER	
			2128	

DATE MAILED: 12/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Non-Responsive Amendment

1. Applicant's reply filed 10/16/2006 is non-responsive.
2. Applicant's responses to the 112(1) and 103 rejections are nonresponsive:
3. As per the 112 Rejections, Applicants refer to an earlier response. However, it is noted

Applicants have not referred to the specification in either case. Applicants state:

"appears to merely disclose generalities." We respectfully disagree. While it is true that the specification describes much of the subject matter on a conceptual level, there is provided sufficient detail to enable one of skill in the pertinent art to make and use the invention.

4. It is unknown what detail Applicants refer to. This is mere allegation and is nonresponsive.

5. As per the 103 rejections:

Applicants state:

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103

This rejection is not clearly stated. We presume that the Examiner meant to state in item 18 on page 7 that claims 1-5 are "unpatentable over Beall in view of McDonald and in view of Squier." If this is not correct, counsel would request the Examiner to telephone counsel so that the matter may be resolved.

6. This interpretation is incorrect. The rejections stated:

18. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beall of McDonald et al. in view of Squier.

Art Unit: 2128

7. Clearly, "or" was misspelled as "of". Consider the rest of the rejection. Consider that if Applicant's argument were correct, there would have been two statements of motivation to combine.

21. Beall et al. or McDonald (in one embodiment) does not expressly disclose running the simulation in standalone mode.

22. Squier discloses that it was well known in 1998 to turn applets into applications.

23. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Beall or McDonald with the teaching of Squier for the following reasons. It would be advantageous to be able to access the simulation when the internet was down, to save on the costs of using the internet and to ensure privacy of the simulated proprietary information.

8. Applicants did not call the Examiner for clarification. Even assuming, for the sake of argument, that this was to be considered an error, Applicants are directed to MPEP 710.06:

If the error in citation or other defective Office action is called to the attention of the Office after the expiration of the period for reply, the period will not be restarted and any appropriate extension fee will be required to render a reply timely. The Office letter correcting the error will note that the time period for reply remains as set forth in the previous Office action.

9. See 37 CFR 1.111. Since the above-mentioned reply appears to be *bona fide*, applicant is given **ONE (1) MONTH or THIRTY (30) DAYS** from the mailing date of this notice, whichever is longer, within which to supply the omission or correction in order to avoid abandonment.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be:

directed to: Dr. Hugh Jones telephone number (571) 272-3781,

Monday-Thursday 0830 to 0700 ET,

Art Unit: 2128

or

the examiner's supervisor, Kamini Shah, telephone number (571) 272-2279.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist, telephone number (703) 305-3900.

mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051 (for formal communications intended for entry)

or (703) 308-1396 (for informal or draft communications, please label *PROPOSED* or *DRAFT*).

Dr. Hugh Jones

Primary Patent Examiner

December 2, 2006

HUGH JONES Ph.D.
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 100